

1 Stacey M. Leyton (SBN 203827)
2 Barbara J. Chisholm (SBN 224656)
3 Danielle Leonard (SBN 218201)
4 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
5 177 Post Street, Suite 300
6 San Francisco, CA 94108
7 Tel: (415) 421-7151
8 Fax: (415) 362-8064
9 sleyton@altber.com
10 bchisholm@altber.com
11 dleonard@altber.com

12 Elena Goldstein (pro hac vice)
13 Skye Perryman (pro hac vice)
14 Tsuki Hoshijima (pro hac vice)
15 DEMOCRACY FORWARD FOUNDATION
16 P.O. Box 34553
17 Washington, DC 20043
18 Tel: (202) 448-9090
19 Fax: (202) 796-4426
20 egoldstein@democracyforward.org
21 sperryman@democracyforward.org
22 thoshijima@democracyforward.org

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

24 [Additional counsel and affiliations listed on signature page]

25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
26 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
27 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

28 AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
29 GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO, et
30 al.,

31 Plaintiffs,

32 v.

33 DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity
34 as President of the United States, et al.,

35 Defendants.

36 Case No. 3:25-cv-03698-SI

37 **PLAINTIFFS' URGENT REQUEST FOR
38 STATUS CONFERENCE RE: NON-
39 COMPLIANCE WITH PRELIMINARY
40 INJUNCTION ORDER**

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Plaintiffs request a status conference to address urgent issues regarding at least two federal
3 agencies' apparent noncompliance with this Court's preliminary injunction. Plaintiffs attempted to
4 resolve these issues informally with Defendants, but the disputes remain unresolved. Plaintiffs
5 therefore request a status conference to discuss these issues and determine the manner the Court
6 would like the parties to proceed with respect to these disputes.

7 The compliance issues concern actions by Federal Agency Defendants implementing
8 reorganization plans pursuant to the Executive Order at issue in this case, through actions that post-
9 date this Court's temporary restraining order ("TRO") and preliminary injunction rulings. The
10 barebones "compliance" Declaration submitted by Defendants on May 30, 2025 did not reveal any
11 details pertaining to agency action subsequent to this Court's orders. Notwithstanding this
12 Declaration, Plaintiffs have received reports that the State Department, Department of Housing and
13 Urban Development ("HUD"), and Department of Health and Human Services ("HHS") have
14 continued to implement Executive Order 14210 notwithstanding this Court's TRO and preliminary
15 injunction, as follows:

- 16 • The State Department has given notice to Congress that it is continuing to implement
17 the reorganization plan (announced April 22, 2025) that was the subject of Plaintiffs'
18 TRO and preliminary injunction motions, and which was specifically referenced by this
19 Court's preliminary injunction order. Specifically, last week the State Department
20 announced that it intends to shortly issue widespread RIF notices to effectuate this
21 reorganization, and counsel for Defendants has taken the new position that this
22 reorganization is not, in fact, covered by this Court's injunction.
- 23 • With respect to HUD, probationary employees have been re-terminated in furtherance
24 of the HUD reduction in workforce efforts, again, after this Court's injunctive orders.
- 25 • HHS employees have been placed on administrative leave or subjected to further off-
26 boarding actions after the TRO and preliminary injunction.

27 Plaintiffs' counsel promptly raised these issues with Defendants' counsel. Defendants
28 acknowledged that HHS took actions subsequent to the Court's orders and represented that HHS

1 would take prompt corrective action, which Plaintiffs are monitoring and therefore do not raise for
 2 resolution by this Court at this time.¹ With respect to State and HUD, however, Defendants have
 3 acknowledged the actions that Plaintiffs contend conflict with the preliminary injunction, but are
 4 taking the position that they are not covered by this Court's orders.

5 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court hold a status conference as soon as possible
 6 this week, so the parties may address how to resolve disputes regarding State Department and HUD
 7 actions subsequent to the Court's orders. Defendants' counsel's position on this request for a status
 8 conference is that they are in compliance with the preliminary injunction so a status conference is
 9 unnecessary, but they will participate in any conference that is set, and that if a conference is set
 10 they request an opportunity for remote participation and that it take place *prior to Friday, June 6*
 11 based on planned absence by counsel.²

12 BACKGROUND

13 On May 9, 2025, this Court issued a TRO enjoining the "implement[ation] or enforce[ment]
 14 [of] sections 3(c) and 3(e) of Executive Order 14210 or the February 26, 2025 OMB/OPM
 15 Memorandum, or the ARRPs." ECF 85 at 40. Specifically, the Court enjoined, among other
 16 things, "any further implementation of the Executive Order, the OMB/OPM Memorandum, or
 17 ARRPs by Federal Agency Defendants, including but not limited to: execution of any existing RIF
 18 notices (including final separation of employees), issuance of any further RIF notices, placement of
 19 employees on administrative leave, and transfer of functions or programs between the agency

20

21

22 ¹ Defendants have represented that all affected employees will be restored to work status by the close
 23 of business today, and the parties are continuing to confirm that all off-boarding actions have been
 24 suspended or reversed. Leonard Decl. Ex. D.

25 ² Defendants' full response, which they requested be shared with this Court, is as follows:
 26 "Defendants are working diligently to comply with the injunction and have been working
 27 constructively with Plaintiffs' counsel to address their concerns, and that a status conference is thus
 28 unnecessary. But of course, if the Court determines that a status conference is appropriate,
 Defendants stand ready to participate in any such conference. Defendants respectfully request that
 any status conference be conducted via telephone or Zoom given that counsel is located in
 Washington, D.C. In addition, if at all possible, Defendants respectfully request that any status
 conference be scheduled prior to Friday June 6 because counsel for the government who presented
 argument at the preliminary injunction hearing will be out of the office beginning June 6, returning
 June 16." Leonard Decl. Ex. D.

1 defendants.” *Id.* The TRO applied to Defendants including the State Department, HUD, and HHS.
 2 *Id.*

3 On May 22, 2025, this Court issued a preliminary injunction that included extending the
 4 relief granted in the TRO. ECF 124. Like the TRO, the preliminary injunction “enjoined” 22
 5 defendant agencies “and their officers or employees or any other individuals acting under their
 6 authority … from taking any actions to implement or enforce sections 3(c) and 3(e) of Executive
 7 Order 14210 or the February 26, 2025 OMB/OPM memorandum.” *Id.* at 47-48. This Court
 8 therefore enjoined, among other things, “any further implementation of ARRPs, including but not
 9 limited to the following actions, to the extent they are taken to implement Executive Order 14210
 10 and/or the OMB/OPM Memorandum: (a) execution of any existing RIF notices (including final
 11 separation of employees), (b) issuance of any further RIF notices, (c) placement of employees on
 12 administrative leave, and (d) transfer of functions or programs between the agency defendants.”
 13 *Id.* at 48. The Court clarified that “this injunction shall not limit federal agency defendants from
 14 presenting reorganization proposals for legislative approval or engaging in their own internal
 15 planning activities without the involvement of OMB, OPM, or DOGE, provided that they do not
 16 implement any of the prohibited actions above.” *Id.* And, “[t]o the extent that defendants need
 17 clarification about whether certain activities are prohibited or allowed by the order,” the Court
 18 instructed, “they may seek such clarification from the Court.” *Id.*

19 To date, Defendants have sought no clarification from this Court regarding the meaning or
 20 application of the injunction.

21 The preliminary injunction order directed Defendants to submit a declaration by 3:00 PM
 22 on Friday, May 30, 2025, “verifying that all defendants have been given notice of [the preliminary
 23 injunction] order and have taken steps to comply.” ECF 85 at 48. On May 30, 2025, Defendants
 24 filed a four-paragraph, one-page declaration from OMB employee Stephen M. Billy, which does
 25 not state that it is based on personal knowledge. ECF 141-1. That declaration states that “counsel
 26 for the Government has … provided compliance instructions to all enjoined components.” *Id.* ¶4.
 27 According to the declaration, those instructions included an explanation of “what the preliminary
 28 injunction prohibits” and “emphasized that enjoined components must comply with the injunction

1 until there is relief from that injunction from this Court or a higher court.” *Id.* Defendants’
 2 declaration does not detail any steps taken by the agencies to comply with the Court’s preliminary
 3 injunction, but states that “[a]ll Defendants have been given notice of this Order and have taken
 4 steps to comply.” *Id.* ¶3. The declaration does not inform the Court that Defendants are taking
 5 actions with respect to reorganization or reduction in the federal workforce that they contend fall
 6 outside the scope of this Court’s injunction. *See generally id.*

7 DISCUSSION

8 Plaintiffs’ efforts to resolve disputes regarding the State Department’s and HUD’s
 9 compliance with the Court’s orders have not been successful. Plaintiffs briefly describe these
 10 reports of non-compliance, efforts to resolve these issues, and the basis for Plaintiffs’ position that
 11 the actions as described raise significant and credible compliance concerns, and request the Court’s
 12 assistance in addressing the appropriate next steps.

13 **A. State:**

14 1. Reports of Non-Compliance

15 Approximately a week after the OMB/OPM deadline for submission of “Phase 2” ARRPs
 16 (see ECF 37-1, Ex. B), on April 22, 2025, the State Department announced a “comprehensive
 17 reorganization plan.” ECF 37-20, Ex. E (Secretary Rubio announcement, crediting “President
 18 Trump’s leadership”); *id.* (“Region-specific functions will be consolidated to increase
 19 functionality, redundant offices will be removed, and non-statutory programs that are misaligned
 20 with America’s core national interests will cease to exist.”); *see also id.* Exs. F-G (New
 21 Organizational Charts); Ex. H (“Department Reorganization FAQs”); Ex. I (“State Department
 22 Reorganization Fact Sheet”). In particular, the April 22, 2025 “Fact Sheet” explained, “the Under
 23 Secretaries will … submit a path to reducing staff in domestic offices by 15 percent, consistent
 24 with the President’s Workforce Optimization Initiative.”³ Leonard Decl. Ex. B (including ECF 37-
 25 20 Ex. I again for this Court’s convenience). The “Workforce Optimization Initiative” is a direct
 26 reference to Executive Order 14210, which is titled “Implementing the President’s ‘Department of

27
 28 ³ It has come to Plaintiffs’ attention that this document was altered to remove the reference to
 “Workforce Optimization” after this Court’s TRO. *Compare* Leonard Decl. Ex. B with Ex. C.

Government Efficiency’ Workforce Optimization Initiative.” *See also, e.g.,* White House, *Fact Sheet: President Donald Trump Works to Remake America’s Federal Workforce* (Feb. 11, 2025) (“Today, President Donald J. Trump signed an Executive Order implementing the President’s Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) workforce optimization initiative.”).⁴

In addition, on April 22, 2025, the State Department conducted a Department Press Briefing, in which its spokesperson stated the following, in response to questions regarding the announced reorganization:

QUESTION: Is DOGE involved at all on this plan, or was this just a State Department proposal?

MS BRUCE: This I think is a very good example of the importance – we know the American people love the result of DOGE. I think there were some questions, perhaps, about how it was applied. And what we do know is that the DOGE approach, the goal of that entity and of that committee, is something the President appreciated and still does, as do the American people very much.

But when – **I believe the President said a few weeks ago that ultimately this was going to be approach – an approach that the secretaries were going to begin to apply.** And also that does make sense, because whether it's the secretaries or the under secretaries or the people running the offices, it is a daily – the daily work of individuals committed to the country, making a difference for the world, and the people on the ground working together know best about how this works, what could change, and how it should change.

So this is, I think, a very good example of the continuation of that mission and the value of that mission to cut government down to size, get people used to the idea that it can happen without it being a bad thing, and then watching the benefits that flow. **So secretaries now in charge of this – remember, this is a – from an executive order. This is a whole-of-government – every department looking at how they can make their department more efficient, less burdensome, less bureaucratic. This is the State Department’s version of that. ...**

Leonard Decl. Ex. A (emphasis added).

Plaintiffs identified this specific “reorganization” as action in furtherance of the EO in both their TRO and preliminary injunction motions. *See e.g.*, ECF 37-1 at 26-27; ECF 101-1 at 7 (citing ECF 101-11 Ex. A); *see also* ECF 37-20 Ex. I. At no point did Defendants contest whether this

⁴ Available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/02/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-works-to-remake-americas-federal-workforce/>.

1 State Department reorganization was being conducted pursuant to the EO. *See generally* ECF 60;
 2 ECF 117. Moreover, in arguing against the disclosure of ARRPs, Defendants invoked the State
 3 Department reorganization as an example of the public learning of plans once they are made. ECF
 4 117 at 5 n.3. In the preliminary injunction order, this Court specifically referenced the State
 5 Department reorganization. ECF 124 at 37.

6 On May 29, 2025, the State Department informed congressional oversight committees that
 7 it intends to proceed with this reorganization including large-scale RIFs *imminently*. Leonard Decl.
 8 ¶3.

9 2. Efforts to Resolve Non-Compliance Issues

10 On May 29, Plaintiffs' counsel alerted Defendants' counsel and inquired about the
 11 imminent reorganization and RIFs, which appeared to violate the preliminary injunction. Leonard
 12 Decl. ¶7, Ex. D. Defendants' counsel responded by confirming that State is proceeding with its
 13 reorganization and asserted, for the first time, that this reorganization is *not* pursuant to the EO but
 14 "was undertaken solely at the direction of Secretary Rubio" and "the result of an internal process."
 15 *Id.* Ex. D. Defendants' counsel also suggested that no RIF notices would be sent until 15 days after
 16 the State Department's notice to Congress. *Id.* In subsequent communications, Defendants'
 17 counsel reiterated these points. *Id.*

18 Defendants have thus far declined Plaintiffs' requests that the State Department comply
 19 with the preliminary injunction by ceasing further implementation of this reorganization, including
 20 by halting forthcoming RIFs. Leonard Decl. Ex. D.

21 3. Non-Compliance Concerns

22 There is no reasonable argument that further implementation of the State Department
 23 reorganization is outside the scope of this Court's injunction. Plaintiffs described this planned
 24 reorganization in their TRO and preliminary injunction briefs; Defendants never argued in response
 25 that this reorganization was "independent" of the EO; and the Court specifically referenced the
 26 reorganization in its preliminary injunction decision. Moreover, this newly asserted position is
 27 contrary to the State Department's contemporaneous statements, as previously explained.

28 If Defendants disagreed with the Plaintiffs' characterization of the State Department

1 reorganization as being pursuant to the EO, they should have raised that disagreement in opposition
 2 to the TRO or preliminary injunction. And if they disagreed with the Court’s injunction of the
 3 State Department’s reorganization plan on the basis that it was not pursuant to the EO, the
 4 appropriate step would have been to move for relief from or modification of the preliminary
 5 injunction—not to unilaterally decide that it did not apply. At the least, Defendants could have
 6 requested “clarification about whether [State’s reorganization was] prohibited or allowed by the
 7 order.” ECF 124 at 48. At a minimum, Defendants should have revealed to the Court this new
 8 position in the compliance declaration that they submitted on May 30, 2025.

9 However, Defendants took none of these steps. Having failed to ask this Court for relief,
 10 any further implementation of this reorganization plan by Defendants, including any imminent RIF
 11 notices, is already enjoined by this Court’s preliminary injunction. As previously noted, Defendant
 12 State Department is taking the position that it is free to issue widespread RIF notices to employees
 13 as soon as June 13 (15 days after the notification of Congress described above).

14 The steps taken to notify Congress do not alleviate Defendants from the obligation of
 15 complying with this Court’s preliminary injunction. This Court clearly instructed that agencies
 16 were free to submit plans “for legislative approval,” “provided that they do not implement any of
 17 the prohibited actions above.” ECF 124 at 48. The State Department is therefore already enjoined
 18 from issuing RIF notices in furtherance of the President’s Workforce Optimization objectives in
 19 the coming days, or taking any further action to implement this reorganization plan.

20 **B. HUD**

21 1. Reports of Non-Compliance

22 The OMB/OPM Memorandum lists “continuing to evaluate probationary employees” as
 23 among the “available tools” for agencies to implement their ARRPs. ECF 100-2 at 2-3. Further,
 24 what appears to be a cover sheet for Phase 2 ARRPs created by OPM/OPM for agency use
 25 identifies the termination of probationary employees as a “Strateg[y]” for reducing the number of
 26 employees at agencies and directs agencies to list the number of probationary employees they plan
 27 to terminate. *See* ECF 96-1 at 23 (non-defendant agency Phase 2 ARRP Cover Sheet).

1 During the week of May 26, Plaintiffs received reports, Leonard Decl. ¶5, which
2 Defendants' counsel confirmed, that "HUD has recently terminated approximately 79 probationary
3 employees" after entry of the TRO on May 9. *Id.* Ex. D.

4 2. Efforts to Resolve Non-Compliance Issues

5 Plaintiffs' counsel also notified Defendants' counsel of this non-compliance concern on
6 May 29. Leonard Decl. Ex. D. When asked about the terminations, Defendants' counsel took the
7 position that "[t]hese termination notices were ... entirely independent of Executive Order 14,210,
8 the February 26 OPM/OMB memorandum, and any HUD submission(s) in response to that
9 Memorandum, including ARRPs" and were instead "based on assessments separate and apart from
10 HUD's ARRP." *Id.* In subsequent communications, Defendants' counsel invoked "a separate
11 Executive Order" titled "Strengthening the Probationary Period." *Id.*

12 Defendants declined Plaintiffs' requests for corrective action. Leonard Decl. Ex. D.
13 Plaintiffs asked for further factual support for Defendants' position that these actions were
14 independent of the HUD ARRP (including whether the HUD ARRP includes discussion of
15 probationary employee terminations), which Defendants' counsel refused to provide on the ground
16 that "HUD's ARRP is confidential" and that, therefore, counsel cannot "characterize it." *Id.*

17 3. Non-Compliance Concerns

18 Defendants have confirmed that HUD did in fact terminate 79 probationary employees after
19 issuance of this Court's TRO. In light of the specific instructions to agencies to use probationary
20 terminations as a "tool" in their ARRPs to achieve workforce reductions in furtherance of the goal
21 of the EO, and inclusion of probationary terminations on what appears to be the ARRP cover sheet,
22 the evidence supports the conclusion that these terminations were in furtherance of the President's
23 EO and OMB/OPM Memorandum, unless Defendants can show otherwise. If the termination of
24 probationary employees is a "tool" in furtherance of the ARRP's workforce reduction goals, then
25 that "tool" was enjoined by this Court's injunctive orders. The Executive Order invoked by

1 defense counsel, notably, does not order the termination of any probationary employees.⁵ Plaintiffs
 2 again request this Court's assistance in determining the appropriate next steps.

3 **C. Defendants' Compliance Declaration**

4 Neither of these actions (nor the HHS actions that Plaintiffs identified) were described in
 5 Defendants' May 30 compliance declaration, which asserted that all Defendants, across the board,
 6 were taking steps to comply with the preliminary injunction, without providing any specific
 7 information and without personal knowledge. ECF 141-1. Plaintiffs would also request the
 8 opportunity to address at the upcoming status conference the need for more fulsome reporting of
 9 steps taken to comply with this Court's orders.

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 Because the parties have been unable to resolve these disputes, Plaintiff respectfully request
 12 an urgent status conference to discuss next steps with the Court.

13
 14 Respectfully submitted,

15
 16 DATED: June 3, 2025

Stacey M. Leyton
 Barbara J. Chisholm
 Danielle E. Leonard
 Corinne F. Johnson
 Alice X. Wang
 Robin S. Tholin
 Aaron Schaffer-Neitz
 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
 177 Post St., Suite 300
 San Francisco, CA 94108
 Tel: (415) 421-7151
 sleyton@altshulerberzon.com
 bchisholm@altshulerberzon.com
 dleonard@altshulerberzon.com

25 By: /s/ Danielle Leonard
 26
 27
 28

⁵ See Exec. Order No. 14288 (April 28, 2025); see also OMB/OPM April 28, 2025 Memorandum, available at <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/latest-memos/initial-guidance-on-president-trump-s-executive-order-strengthening-probationary-periods-in-the-federal-service-2.pdf> ("The EO establishes rules and policies for managing probationary and trial periods across both the competitive and excepted services.").

1 *Attorneys for All Union and Non-Profit Organization*
2 *Plaintiffs*

3 Elena Goldstein (pro hac vice)
4 Skye Perryman (pro hac vice)
5 Tsuki Hoshijima (pro hac vice)
6 DEMOCRACY FORWARD FOUNDATION
7 P.O. Box 34553
8 Washington, D.C. 20043
9 Tel: (202) 448-9090
Fax: (202) 796-4426
egoldstein@democracyforward.org
sperryman@democracyforward.org
thoshijima@democracyforward.org

10 By: /s/ Elena Goldstein

11 *Attorneys for All Union and Non-Profit Organization*
12 *Plaintiffs (except NRDC) and for Plaintiffs City of*
13 *Chicago, IL; Martin Luther King, Jr. County, WA;*
14 *Harris County, TX; and City of Baltimore, MD*

15 Jules Torti (pro hac vice)
16 PROTECT DEMOCRACY PROJECT
17 82 Nassau St., #601
New York, NY 10038

18 Erica J. Newland (pro hac vice)
19 Jacek Pruski (pro hac vice)
20 PROTECT DEMOCRACY PROJECT
21 2020 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 163
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel: 202-579-4582
jules.torti@protectdemocracy.org
erica.newland@protectdemocracy.org
jacek.pruski@protectdemocracy.org

22 By: /s/ Jules Torti

23 *Attorneys for All Union and Non-Profit Organization*
24 *Plaintiffs (except NRDC)*

25 Norman L. Eisen (pro hac vice)
26 Spencer W. Klein (pro hac vice)
27 STATE DEMOCRACY DEFENDERS FUND

1 600 Pennsylvania Avenue SE #15180
2 Washington, D.C. 20003
3 Tel: (202) 594-9958
4 Norman@statedemocracydefenders.org
Spencer@statedemocracydefenders.org

5 By: /s/ Norman L. Eisen

6 *Attorneys for All Union and Non-Profit Organization*
7 *Plaintiffs (except NRDC)*

8 Rushab Sanghvi (SBN 302809)
9 AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT
EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO
10 80 F Street, NW
11 Washington, D.C. 20001
Tel: (202) 639-6426
12 Sanghr@afge.org

13 By: /s/ Rushab Sanghvi

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs American Federation of*
15 *Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE) and AFGE*
16 *locals*

17 Teague Paterson (SBN 226659)
18 Matthew Blumin (pro hac vice)
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY,
19 AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO
1625 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 775-5900
20 TPaterson@afscme.org
21 MBlumin@afscme.org

22 By: /s/ Teague Paterson

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff American Federation of State*
24 *County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO*
(AFSCME)

26 Steven K. Ury (SBN 199499)
27 SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL
UNION, AFL-CIO
28 1800 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.

1 Washington, D.C. 20036
2 Tel: (202) 730-7428
3 steven.ury@seiu.org

4 By: /s/ Steven K. Ury

5 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Service Employees
International Union, AFL-CIO (SEIU)*

6
7 David Chiu (SBN 189542)
8 City Attorney
9 Yvonne R. Meré (SBN 175394)
10 Chief Deputy City Attorney
11 Mollie M. Lee (SBN 251404)
12 Chief of Strategic Advocacy
13 Sara J. Eisenberg (SBN 269303)
14 Chief of Complex and Affirmative Litigation
15 Molly J. Alarcon (SBN 315244)
16 Alexander J. Holtzman (SBN 311813)
17 Deputy City Attorneys
18 OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY FOR THE
19 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
20 1390 Market Street, 7th Floor
21 San Francisco, CA 94102
22 molly.alarcon@sfcityatty.org
23 alexander.holtzman@sfcityatty.org

24 By: /s/ Alexander Holtzman

25 *Attorneys for Plaintiff City and County of San
26 Francisco*

27
28 Tony LoPresti (SBN 289269)
COUNTY COUNSEL
Kavita Narayan (SBN 264191)
Meredith A. Johnson (SBN 291018)
Raphael N. Rajendra (SBN 255096)
Hannah M. Godbey (SBN 334475)
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA
70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, 9th Floor
San José, CA 95110
Tel: (408) 299-5900
Kavita.Narayan@cco.sccgov.org
Meredith.Johnson@cco.sccgov.org
Raphael.Rajendra@cco.sccgov.org

1 Hannah.Godbey@cco.sccgov.org

2 By: /s/ Tony LoPresti

3 *Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Santa Clara, Calif.*

5 David J. Hackett (pro hac vice)
6 General Counsel to King County Executive & Special
7 Deputy Prosecutor
8 Alison Holcomb (pro hac vice)
9 Deputy General Counsel to King County Executive &
10 Special Deputy Prosecutor
11 Erin King-Clancy (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)
12 Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
13 OFFICE OF KING COUNTY PROSECUTING
14 ATTORNEY LEESA MANION
15 401 5th Avenue, Suite 800
16 Seattle, WA 98104
17 (206) 477-9483
18 David.Hackett@kingcounty.gov
19 aholcomb@kingcounty.gov
aclancy@kingcounty.gov

20 By: /s/ David J. Hackett

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Martin Luther King, Jr. County*

22 Sharanya Mohan (CABN 350675)
23 PUBLIC RIGHTS PROJECT
24 490 43rd Street, Unit #115
25 Oakland, CA 94609
26 Tel: (510) 738-6788
27 sai@publicrightsproject.org

28 By: /s/ Sharanya Mohan

29 *Attorney for Plaintiffs Baltimore, MD, Chicago, IL,
30 Harris County, TX, and King County, WA*

31 Christian D. Menefee
32 Harris County Attorney
33 Jonathan G.C. Fombonne (pro hac vice)
34 Deputy County Attorney and First Assistant
35 Tiffany Bingham (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)
36 Managing Counsel
37 Sarah Utley (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)
38 Division Director – Environmental Division
39 Bethany Dwyer (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)

Deputy Division Director - Environmental Division
R. Chan Tysor (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)
Senior Assistant County Attorney
Alexandra "Alex" Keiser (pro hac vice)
Assistant County Attorney
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
Tel: (713) 274-5102
Fax: (713) 437-4211
jonathan.fombonne@harriscountytx.gov
tiffany.bingham@harriscountytx.gov
sarah.utley@harriscountytx.gov
bethany.dwyer@harriscouptytx.gov
chan.tysor@harriscountytx.gov
alex.keiser@harriscountytx.gov

By: /s/ Jonathan G.C. Fombonne

Attorneys for Plaintiff Harris County, Texas

Mary B. Richardson-Lowry,
Corporation Counsel of the City of Chicago
Stephen J. Kane (IL ARDC 6272490) (pro hac vice
app. forthcoming)
Rebecca A. Hirsch (IL ARDC 6279592) (pro hac
vice)
Lucy Prather (IL ARDC 6337780) (pro hac vice)
City of Chicago Department of Law,
Affirmative Litigation Division
121 N LaSalle Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60602
Tel: (312) 744-6934
Stephen.kane@cityofchicago.org
Rebecca.Hirsch2@cityofchicago.org
Lucy.Prather@cityofchicago.org

By: /s/ Stephen J. Kane

Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Chicago

Ebony M. Thompson
Baltimore City Solicitor
Sara Gross (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)
Chief of Affirmative Litigation
Baltimore City Department of Law
100 N. Holliday Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

1 Tel: (410) 396-3947
2 sara.gross@baltimorecity.gov

3 By: /s/ Sara Gross
4

5 *Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Baltimore*
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28